

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are all the claims pending in the present application. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 3-11 and 14-20 contain allowable subject matter, and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1, 2, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Christopher et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,900,845). Applicants traverse these rejections at least based on the following reasons.

Christopher is directed to a video decoder that transcodes video data from various input formats to a predetermined output format. Input data may be standard definition data or MPEG2 compressed data. Standard definition data are rearranged into block format be compatible with the decoder's single display processor. The display processor selectively processes and conveys either MPEG2 format data or non-MPEG2 format data to a display device. A block based frame memory stores MPEG2 and non-MPEG2 pixel block data, as well as standard definition data in raster line format during processing. *See Abstract of Christopher.*

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicants submit that Christopher does not disclose or suggest at least, "a test data generator for generating test data corresponding to input items of a user based on the input items of the user and said at least information on the raw data and the MPEG transport stream standard," as recited in claim 1. With respect to the above-quoted feature, the Examiner simply alleges the decoder 10 in Christopher satisfies the feature above. Further, the Examiner alleges that the input signals in Christopher are inherently selectable. In response, first, Applicants submit that, nowhere does Christopher even mention any signals in Christopher being selectable. Further, even if, *arguendo*, said signals could be selected, the feature quoted above is still not satisfied. Claim 1 recites, in part, generating test

data corresponding to input items of a user. According to Applicants' understanding, Christopher does not even mention generating test data.

Yet even further, Applicants submit that the Examiner's position is confusing and inconsistent. That is, the Examiner appears to believe that the decoder 10 in Fig. 2A corresponds to the claimed "automatic test data generating apparatus." However, the Examiner also alleges that the decoder 10 corresponds to the claimed test data generator which constitutes the automatic test data generating apparatus.

In addition, the Examiner cites MPEG input 2 and NON-MPEG input 4, as shown in Fig. 1 of Christopher, as allegedly corresponding to the claimed first database. However, the cited signals clearly do not correspond to a database and there is no teaching or suggestion of these signals being sent by a database.

At least based on the arguments above, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the applied references.

Applicants submit that independent claim 12 is patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1. In particular, Applicants submit that Christopher does not disclose or suggest at least, "generating the test data corresponding to information on input items with reference to the database, when input item information on desired test data is input from a user," as recited in claim 12.

Applicants submit that dependent claims 2 and 13 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 12.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Diallo T. Crenshaw  
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 26, 2008